

	Flip Chart Comment	Action
FC 1	Principle #6 - How is “operational flexibility” defined? Legal as well as physical constraints of the dam?	Glossary will include definitions for “operational flexibility” and “legal flexibility.”
	Some current and target levels seem unbelievable: for example, MO 2 goes from 5 gm/m ² → 5000 gm/m ²	The numbers have not been fully vetted and will be looked at more closely.
	MO 1 and MO 4, et al.: → how can target levels be obtained from literature?	In some cases, they can’t – literature will give us guidelines. In these cases, it should read “IN,” and targets will be justified in terms of where we are headed. In other cases, the research has been completed; thus, we will obtain from literature.
	How do we address the broad issue of what is within and what is without AMP boundaries.	Issue Paper C addresses this issue. MOs are what are needed to achieve Goals. Some MOs and MAs may be within the AMP, others may not be. These will be distinguished at the MA level.
	Goal 2 - ensure “remove jeopardy doesn’t mean “recovery” (glossary)	Rick Gold - recovery would mean more \$ - shouldn’t just be power revenues. Goal does address viable populations. Recovery not possible in Grand Canyon. The ad hoc committee will address John Shields’ issue on whether ESA issues are part of the AMP. Issue Paper E will be further fleshed out.
FC 2	MO 15 - what does % mean for current level?	Refers to the % of total fish captured.
	Goal 3 - discuss what “as feasible” means.	The ad hoc committee will revise this response.
	MO 17 is inconsistent with MO 13.	Issue Paper B addresses this issue. The emphasis is on trout above the Paria, and native fish in the entire reach with emphasis below Paria. Viable populations are not identified by species. Ad hoc committee will revise definition of “viable” and “native fish” in the glossary.
	differentiation of habitat needs of trout and native fish below Paria River	Trout are not addressed at all below the Paria. Native habitat is addressed.

	Flip Chart Comment	Action
	MO 17 clarify as minimums the target levels for growth rate, abundance, and condition	Ad hoc committee will address this and small group will address this.
	How can target level be a “process” rather than specific objective? Not measurable.	Decision Process definition was discussed and clarified. (see handout)
FC 3	MO 21 - what is 329,000 m ³ @ 35 sites) what are we measuring?	Standard study sites from a particular study. The data may not be sufficient, but it is what we have available. Sediment small group will address.
	Goal 6 – The proposed change is from “Increase fine sediment storage” to “Maintain or attain levels of sediment...” Maintain at what levels? Is this an Information Need?	The word “storage” will be added back into the goal.
	“Information need” could be set as a general description (philosophic) that would lead to specific numbers	Qualitative targets will be prepared to guide the development of quantitative targets.
	Has KAS genetic research been completed?	No. It’s not complete but most folks are confident it’s a unique taxon. The Ad hoc will continue to use KAS until research is complete.
	KAS expert panel should cause revision of levels	Yes.
	How do IN’s tie into experimental flows?	Experimental flows result from IN’s.
FC 4	Does the phrase “within the framework of GCDAMP ecosystem goals” in a goal imply a hierarchy?	The reference in goal 8, “... in a manner consistent with riparian ecosystem goals,” and the references in goals 10 and 11, “...within the framework of GCDAMP ecosystem goals,” is intended to indicate a hierarchy or order of precedence. That is, the accomplishment of Goals 8, 10, and 11 should be undertaken in such a way that the likelihood of achieving the ecosystem goals is not impaired.
	MO 39: – “maintain or enhance wilderness” – which is it?	Enhance means make a positive contribution to the resource, don’t let it degrade. “Attain or maintain” means we think we aren’t yet where we should be.

	Flip Chart Comment	Action
		Consider putting definitions in the Glossary.
	Goal 8 - why does it say “consistent with <u>riparian</u> ecosystem goals” when other goals say “consistent with GCDAMP ecosystem goals”?	Either way works. The riparian ecosystem goal referred to in Goal 8 is Goal 9. The riparian ecosystem goal (Goal 9) is more appropriate because it would be most relevant for SWF, but either approach could be used.
	Goal 10 & MO 39 are inconsistent (managing as wilderness w/o motors)	The word wilderness does not mean “Wilderness Act” wilderness; rather, a wilderness experience. These are not mutually exclusive. It was not the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee to get involved in the motors discussion.
	Goal 11 - terms “power and energy” unclear (capacity and energy?)	Will replace “power and energy” with “capacity and energy generation.” Small group will provide definitions for the Glossary.
	How does “river corridor” fit within the charge for the AMP? (scope issue)	Scope already established - overall and for each MO
FC 5	Goal 12: “Past” generations - how do we inspire and benefit them?	Addresses ancestral concerns of Native Americans. Small group will address.
	“APE” definition should be in the glossary	Small group to define for Glossary.
	How does MO 41 address protect of canyon resources?	Grand Canyon as a traditional cultural property. Our charge may be smaller Ad hoc committee will address.
	MO 46 - maintain <u>and</u> attain? (MO 47–49)	Multiple attributes in MO 46. Some are one, some another
	MO 46 - is N/A appropriate for “at some place”?	Yes, because we’re discussing data
	MO 46 - tribal view is being segregated, shouldn’t isolate	no change proposed but the values should be considered throughout
	MO 41 - preserve or treat	The small group will consider this.
FC 6	MO 49 - target level is more than \$ figure - what does full tribal participation mean?	Switch element and attribute. The cultural small group will address.
	MO 50 – any idea of what	The note in the Comments column is changed to

	Flip Chart Comment	Action
	information need might be?	read, “Target level is the experiments needed to gain critical understanding of ecosystem function under different dam operations.”
	MO 50 - should include hydropower generation in comments column	The note in the Comments column is changed to read: “Target level is the experiments needed to gain critical understanding of ecosystem function under different dam operations.”
	MO 51 - “APE” instead of “CRE”?	Small group will address.
	MO 26 - 12 breeding pairs accurate?	Data represents a given point in time – ACH needs to address confidence intervals and which point in time we’re going to choose. Geographic scope is also an issue – are they LAME or CRE? Resolved through quantitative targets.
FC 7	Goal 2 - how do we remove jeopardy from razorback sucker if none exist in the Canyon?	Jeopardy removed by completion of RPA’s of BO.
	Goal 1 - what are the desired species?	No need to enumerate desired species, but fish are an indicator of ecosystem health.
	Keep MOs 52, 53, 54 as part of Goal 14	Retained under Goal 13.
	MO 10 - does BO require 1 add’l population of HBC?	Yes. “spawning aggregation” - comments section. USBR will check on BO language.
	be consistent with recovery goals of FWS Region 6	See Issue Paper E

Other notes from the AMWG meeting:

- Build in a feedback loop
- Will all objectives be measurable?
- Targets may change as we learn more.
- Current and target levels may be a range.

R:\WEB\twg-00sep20\FC Changes.doc